DOCUMENT RESUME

UD 005 709

ED 022 823

By-Broudy, Harry S.

SCHOOLING FOR THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED.

Pub Date Oct 65

Note-7p.; Paper presented at the Articulation Conference (University of Illinois, Allerton House, February 21, 1965).

Journal Cit-The Teachers College Journal; v37 n1 p4, 14-18 Oct 1965

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.36

Descriptors-ASPIRATION, *CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, *ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, ECONOMIC FACTORS, *EDUCATION, GENERAL EDUCATION, HISTORICAL REVIEWS, LOWER CLASS STUDENTS, MIDDLE CLASS CULTURE, MIDDLE CLASS VALUES, NEGROES, POVERTY PROGRAMS, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, SOCIAL DISCRIMINATION, SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, TEACHER ATTITUDES, TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHER MOTIVATION

In a review of historical efforts to improve the condition of the poor by education, it is noted that these attempts failed to lessen the problems of poverty. In the past the capitalist factory system demanded a cheap labor supply and therefore education was viewed only as a necessary vocational preparation. The contemporary issues of poverty and education are intimately interwoven with the problem of color discrimination and economic improvement. Today's concern with education for disadvantaged groups is actually derived less from a stronger social conscience now than from factors which make poverty "economically disastrous, militarily dangerous, and politically inexpedient." Nevertheless, the chances for success are greater now because of a constellation of new forces. The impetus for the education of the disadvantaged may come from inspired amateurs but an army of competent professionals is essential. To maximize the productive potentiality of all people 12 years of general education in the sciences and humanities are recommended. Moreover, the toughness and resourcefulness of the lower-class child are qualities which should not only be preserved but are ones which the middle-class child might well emulate. (NH)

ED022823
UD 005 709

Table of Contents

Theme for this Issue:
TEACHING THE DISADVANTAGED

Introduction 1

Guest Editorial 2
EDUCATION IS THE FOUNDATION
The Honorable Birch Bayh, U.S. Senator From Indiana

Focus on the Needs of All Children
GUIDEPOSTS FOR LOVE AND UNDERSTANDING 3
Clara and Morey Appell

Historical and Social Psychological Factors
SCHOOLING FOR THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED 4
Harry S. Broudy

THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD: PRIMARY GROUP TRAINING FOR SECONDARY GROUP LIFE 5
Lloyd B. Lueptow

Two Curriculum Proposals
COMPENSATORY LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN 6
Walter J. Moore

CURRICULUM INNOVATIONS FOR DISADVANTAGED ELEMENTARY CHILDREN—WHAT SHOULD THEY BE? 7
Mildred B. Smith

Special Centers for the Disadvantaged
THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER: A PROGRAM TO PROVIDE CHILDREN A "HEAD START" IN LIFE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRIMARY EDUCATION 8
Catherine R. Hudson

THE INDIANAPOLIS CENTER: REPORT ON TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM FOR INDIANAPOLIS PRE-SCHOOL CENTERS 9
Lucille Ingalls

Appeals for Commitment and Sensitivity
THE ELEMENTARY TEACHER AND THE DISADVANTAGED—BUG IN A TUB 10
Paul W. Koester

MORE TENDER HEARTS 11
Clara and Morey Appell

A TEACHER VISITS THE HOMES OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN 12
Ann Williams

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS—
In addition to the writers, several persons have helped in planning and preparing this edition of the **Journal:** the I.S.U. Audio-Visual Department, all pictures except the one from Sen. Bayh's office; Dr. Paul W. Koester, suggestions for most of the writers; and the University's Division of Printing, reproduction services.

The Teachers College Journal of the School of Education is printed at the Indiana State University Division of Printing

THE TEACHERS COLLEGE JOURNAL

VOLUME XXXVII. No. 1, OCTOBER, 1965

editor
JOEL L. BURDIN
Associate Professor of Education

assistant to the editor
SARA ELKINS

editorial associates
CHARLES W. HARDAWAY
Acting Vice-President and Dean of Faculty
MARK NEVILLE
Professor of English
BYRON WESTFALL
Professor of Education

editorial board
ALAN C. RANKIN
President, Indiana State University
WILLIAM E. ENGBRETSON
Dean, School of Education
ARTHUR SCHULZ
Acting Director of Printing Production

The Teachers College Journal seeks to present competent discussions of professional problems in education and toward this end restricts its contributing personnel to those of training and experience in the field. The Journal does not engage in re-publication practice, in belief that previously published material, however creditable, has already been made available to the professional public through its original publication.

Manuscripts concerned with controversial issues are welcome, with the express understanding that all such issues are published without editorial bias or discrimination.

Articles are presented on the authority of their writers, and do not necessarily commit the Journal to points of view so expressed. At all times the Journal reserves the right to refuse publication if in the opinion of the Editorial Board an author has violated standards of professional ethics or journalistic presentation.

Published October, November, December, January, March, and May by Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana. Entered as second-class matter October 5, 1931, at the Post Office at Terre Haute, Indiana, under act of August 24, 1912.

EDUCATIONAL PRESS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Historical Review...

Schooling for the Culturally Deprived[1]

by Harry S. Broudy

Introduction

THE SCHOOLING of the culturally deprived and the disadvantaged child, is, at the moment, one of the liveliest issues on the educational stock exchange.[2] One wonders why this is so. After all, the poor and the downtrodden have always been with us; indeed this has been the most faultless of Scriptural predictions.

There are obvious and perhaps superficial factors in our present concern. The rise of delinquency, the violence spurting out of the civil rights movements in the last few years, the heavy relief rolls at times when prosperity is generally widespread—all of these have made the public sensitive to the possibility of worse things to come. The people are frightened.

In the presidential campaign (1964) Senator Goldwater pointed to these conditions as good reasons for throwing out the Democrats. President Johnson pointed to them as very good reasons for his remaining in office. Goldwater blamed the situation on too much welfare legislation; Johnson on too little. The public was with Johnson on this point. A veritable avalanche of legislation allowing or ordering someone to do something about poverty and schooling is now roaring through the Congressional hopper.

The deeper factors appear when one asks how it is possible for a society living at the highest point on the hog, so to speak, to have such huge pockets of poverty? How is it that the newspapers are filled with pleas for workers in the engineering and business fields, and yet millions of people are unemployed? This has elicited the response that the unemployment is selective; that only the very unskilled and unschooled are unemployed.

Peter F. Drucker, the New York University economist, in the January 10, 1965, issue of the *New York Times Sunday Magazine* made some interesting observations on the causes of unemployment.

(1) "The real villain is the tremendous upgrading in the country's educational level—a ten to twenty per cent minority of our young people but still a large total number, especially of younger Negroes —are losing ground in status and opportunities."

(2) He doubts that the real villain is automation, for although the core of "our present unemployment is made up of teen-agers, especially teen-age Negroes . . . most of these get jobs when they become adults; that is, when they become available for full-time work. After 20, there is a dramatic drop in the joblessness rate, even among Negroes."

(3) He argues that the fact that the large majority of young people have high school or college diplomas explains why jobs calling for these qualifications have been increasing so fast. This sounds a bit odd, but perhaps it is clarified in the next point.

(4) The availability of large numbers of high school and college graduates makes it possible for foremanships and supervisory jobs that once used to go to floor workers in the factory or office workers to be given to management trainees. Work layout, loading plans, and other jobs that require "knowledge power" are being split off from the hand power parts of the task and given to the better schooled workers. This downgrades the manual worker even more.

But why in a nation proud of its schools and school laws do we have men and women who are illiterate, literally and functionally? The average American citizen, caught by a pollster on the street, would have thought that illiteracy had been wiped out in the country long ago.

We are then told that illiteracy and the school dropouts are caused by cultural deprivation: that the home life and community life of the Negro, especially in the South but often in the North, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, Mountain Hollow

Continued on page 14

DR. BROUDY *is Professor of Philosophy of Education at the University of Illinois. Dr. Broudy has written extensively. His books have included* Building a Philosophy of Education (Second Edition) *and* Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education (Co-author).

[1]Prepared for delivery at the Articulation Conference, Allerton House, University of Illinois, February 21, 1965.

[2]So voluminous and diverse has the literature become that a clearing house for it is already in operation at the Yeshiva College in New York City. A report on "The Research Relevance of Desegregation," by Meyer Weinberg, delivered at the New England Conference on Educational Research, Rhode Island College, Providence, November 27-28, contained a reference list of 120 items.

UD 005 709

The children were delighted when their mothers said they could come to the special summer program. Immediately they began questioning, "Well, is it tomorrow?" or "Is it next week?" or "How long is it?" Then, younger or older brothers and sisters would ask, "Can I go, too?" The children wanted to come to school, and they were excited about it.

Young children want to learn and want to come to school. How often culturally disadvantaged children come and meet failure! By the time these children are in fourth or fifth grade, they often remark, "I hate school." School work is made to be something that they cannot achieve; their great desire to learn is destroyed; and they do not want to come to school. The school has not provided for their needs.

An important part of my home visit was listening to the mothers. They wanted very much to talk, not always about school, not always about their children. I did not answer, "I know how it feels to be poor." I didn't know how it felt to sleep on a raw mattress without bed linens. But the mother and I did have one thing in common—the welfare of her child.

When I left the house, a flock of children was usually waiting for me outside. They asked, "Are you coming to my house?" If I had to tell them "No," the disappointed look on their faces gave me a guilt complex. I was the Pied Piper walking back to my car with my followers holding my hand or hanging on to my dress. Driving home, I tried to think of the kinds of experiences the school needs to provide for these culturally disadvantaged children.

Each morning as they greeted me in the classroom with their smiles, I wanted to ask them, "How can I help you?" If only we were perceptive enough to understand what they tell us, we would know.[1]

---

[1]A special class was conducted in The Laboratory School to provide observation and participation experiences for teachers enrolled in the I.S.U. reading institute organized to help teachers teach disadvantaged children. Four centers were also developed in the city of Terre Haute for the I.S.U. reading institute for teachers of disadvantaged children, summer, 1965.

Guideposts for Love and Understanding

Continued from page 3

understandings are over, let us hope and trust they can become "bygones."

(10) *Teachers and parents can help children to face the realities of life.*

Without burdening children, we can be honest about family problems, social problems, disappointments, death, etc. This can be done in terms of the age level and understanding of the child.

(11) *Children can be helped to develop a wholesome sense of humor.*

The smile and the laugh are the vitamins of emotional health. Realistic optimism and humor can make many a problem lighter. Besides, adults can enjoy and share the spontaneous delights of children.

(12) *Each child is unique in his own right and his intrinsic worth.*

It is best to avoid comparing children in the same class, the same or different families. Every child develops and grows at his own individual pace. Growth may not be even in all directions.

(13) *All who work with children must recognize that all behavior is caused.*

There are reasons for everything that happens. However, those who help children must recognize they are human and possess frailties —and avoid expecting impossible perfection. Then, too, every adult who works or lives with children is not a trained psychologist or psychiatrist and cannot attempt to constantly analyze and interpret all behavior.

(14) *Children grow through certain basic developmental stages with unique variations for each one.*

Some walk at nine months and others walk at eighteen months; some sit at five months. Emotional growth finds its own rhythm too. If you cannot be immature at four, five, six, or seven, when can you?

(15) *Every stage of growth is important. All of life is important.*

Let us help children to feel that we love them as they are: boy or girl, baby or toddler or school age child, slim or heavy, light or dark. It is good to be what you are if others help you to feel valued that way and to see life in that manner. The challenge is ours.

Schooling for the Culturally Deprived

Continued from page 4

Folks and their like create successive generations of candidates for the relief rolls, broken families, potential lawbreakers, unemployables, and the like. It is generally agreed that the term "socially disadvantaged" covers a low educational level of the parents, low income, meager experience with the environment beyond the home, poor housing, poor health, and broken or incomplete families. Presumably children from such families and in such surroundings do not develop enough linguistically or conceptually to benefit from ordinary schooling, or at least their talking and thinking are not what the school expects of them. Furthermore, the desire to learn and even to be in school is feeble when compared to that of the culturally replete child.[3] Yet some research shows that many lower-class Negro mothers have high educational aspirations for their children.[4]

So much, I believe, is by now familiar; and it has been made clear that schooling is the wedge that will break the vicious chain. We are promised that there will be huge sums for the retraining of the adult, the improvements of his environment, and a massive attack on the resistance to learning now found in the children due to the cultural deprivation, which is caused by poverty, which is caused by ignorance, which is caused by cultural deprivation.

Powerful a tool as education is, and granting that it is to be the growth industry of the future, one should not be carried away. Education enables us to exploit social and economic potentialities, but it cannot create these potentialities, certainly not all of them. The State of California, we are told, has invested heavily in schooling; but it did not of itself create the airplane and other industries nor the tremendous immigration of citizens into that state that makes schooling so usable. Education is the most promising long-term weapon in fighting poverty and its consequences because conditions are just about right for the investment to pay off.

As one reads and listens one is inevitably reminded that this is not the first time in history that education has been elected to redeem the lowly and unfortunate child. Several outstanding examples come to mind. One was Johann Heinhich Pestalozzi (1746-1827), the famous Swiss educator, who saw in education a way of redeeming the misery and depravity of the poor, especially the poor in the mills.

Pestalozzi wanted to regenerate the culturally deprived by producing in each child a deep sense of worth and dignity in making him aware of his own powers. To do so he founded several schools for indigent children in which literacy, manual skills, and character reformation through "family" love were to be featured. This was a pattern that many others, including some of our contemporaries, were to follow.

These efforts were failures; Pestalozzi's schools at Burgdorf and Yverdon were successful only when they became showcases for new methods of teaching the well-to-do rather than redeeming the indigent. And Pestalozzi was discouraged as much by the indifference of his wretched beneficiaries as by that of the rich benefactors.

Just as the 18th century was drawing to a close, Robert Owen (1771-1858), director of large cotton mills at New Lanark in Scotland, undertook to improve the morals and living conditions of the laboring class in the community. Especially noteworthy is that Owen started with infant schools for children five to ten years of age. It should also be recalled that in 1802 Parliament enacted its first compulsory education law entitled "An Act for the Preservation of the Health and Morals of Apprentices and others Employed in Cotton and other Mills, and Cotton and other Factories." Section 6 of the law stipulated that every apprentice should receive instruction for part of the working day in reading, writing, and arithmetic, or either of them."[5]

Both in Britain and the United States the common school movement had its first proddings from the problem of orphans and the children of the wretched poor. Since these children could not possibly be provided for by their parents, the only recourse was to private or public charity; and public charity, of course, was achieved by taxation.

In the same vein recall the work of August Hermann Francke, a German pietist of the 17th cen-

---

[3]Robert J. Havighurst, *Public Schools of Chicago* (Chicago: The Board of Education, 1964), p. 57.

[4]Robert R. Bell, "Lower Class Negro Mothers and Their Children," *Integrated Education*, December 1964-January 1965 (Philadelphia).

[5]Frederick Eby and C. F. Arrowood, *The Development of Modern Education* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1940), pp. 614ff.

tury in Halle, Germany. He also was committed to the notion that the regeneration of the poor could be accomplished by education. Nor need we recount the efforts of both the Catholic and Protestant churches in various countries to rescue the poor through preaching and teaching.

Whatever good these efforts accomplished, they did little to diminish the problems of poverty; for every branch snatched from the burning, a dozen brushfires sprang up to replace them. The good effects, as a matter of fact, were not in the reduction of poverty, but rather in providing experience and precedents for the establishment of a common, tax-supported, compulsory school system.

So the recognition of poverty as a cause of social evil and the recourse to education to remedy it are hardly new. Why were these attempts not successful? Chiefly because human labor was regarded as a commodity to be bought as cheaply and exploited as much as possible. For a long time the factory system tried to live up to Karl Marx's description of it. Marx had argued that capitalism must exploit labor and keep it at a subsistence level, because profit was produced by the extra hours of labor, over and above those needed to produce an article, that the employer could extort free of charge from the laborer. In early capitalistic factory production, poverty was regarded as necessary to profit, and cheap labor was the instrument of industrial progress. The resultant human misery and degradation were deplored by good Christians; but since the laws of supply and demand were regarded by economists as having the status of Newton's laws of motion, industrialists did not really believe poverty and exploitation could or should be prevented. They did feel obligated by Christian principles to relieve it by charity. Philanthropy was expected of the wealthy, and often it was forthcoming; but not only could the 18th and 19th centuries tolerate large pockets of poverty, they could not seem to flourish without them. As for the children of the poor, education was designed to give them a vocational skill, a willingness to work, and a strong belief that in heaven social injustices would be abolished and their patience rewarded. Even so liberal a thinker as John Locke saw nothing more as necessary for them.

Our problem in many ways resembles that of previous ages, but in one important respect it differs, viz., in the fact that the ranks of the socially disadvantaged include disproportionately large numbers of people who have been victims of color discrimination. In addition to improving their economic lot, these people have to fight segregation that prevents them from achieving a means to better themselves. So far as educational opportunity is concerned the American problem is so closely interwoven with segregated and integrated schools that it is unrealistic to make believe that the problem of the disadvantaged white is the same as that of the disadvantaged Negro.

If all these historical efforts to redeem the culturally deprived—by education—failed, what reasons do we have to believe that we can succeed now?

New Factors Increase the Nation's Concerns

The new factor in today's concern with education of the culturally deprived is not a more sensitive conscience, but rather a set of circumstances that makes poverty in large pockets economically disastrous, militarily dangerous, and politically inexpedient.

It is economically disastrous, because in a large-scale mechanized industrial society production tends to outstrip consumption. The rich can step up their spending for luxuries, but this is not enough. Large amounts of mass-produced staples and luxuries must be disposed of at a profit, so the poor also must be given enough to buy the product of our industrial machine. In other words, people who cannot produce and consume at a high rate are not only an intolerable economic burden; they are positively subversive of the total economic enterprise.

Likewise, our modern mechanized, electronized, atomicized military machine cannot operate with functionally illiterate soldiers or civilians. We cannot fight or threaten to fight wars without huge cadres of highly skilled workmen, automation notwithstanding.

Finally, it happens to be a fact that the poor have votes or, in the new nations, guns and that all over the world they threaten to use votes or guns to get their share of the good life. Social conditions are on the side of social justice, and this makes the current attack on the problem more promising than ever before. For happy is the nation that can afford to realize its ideals.

Another factor that militates in favor of success is that the suggested remedies strike at social conditions that give rise to deprivation. For example, a significant feature of the current move on the problem is the attention being given to the preschool child, on the theory that intervention

has the greatest effect at this period." It makes sense to render the children more educable—if, at the same time, we modify the homes and neighbors so that schooling takes hold. This social assist the earlier reformers did not have. Our current approaches, while resembling a clutch of bandwagons rushing off in all directions, may yet verify Gunnar Myrdal's hypothesis. That noted student of the Negro problem insisted that real social change comes when the equivalent of a chain reaction sets in; when laws, education, job opportunities, and moral fervor all reciprocally intensify their effect. We seem to be approaching that state of affairs in dealing with the culturally disadvantaged.

Some Reflections

What then remains to be said on this problem? Much, no doubt, but I shall confine myself to a few reflections.

First of all, it occurs to me that the teaching of disadvantaged children and the administration of such schools should be professionalized, and that the recruitment and training of teachers and other personnel be organized on that basis. Much as I share the general admiration for the Peace Corps, much as I applaud the efforts of college students to tutor Negro children, and much as I believe in the power of money bonuses, I would rather not place all my bets on any one of them or all of them.

Much as a Dr. Schweitzer or a Dr. Dooley have accomplished, a large corps of professionally competent but relatively uninspired physicians would have accomplished even more. Talented and dedicated amateurs achieve impressive results and do marvelous things, especially when they feel like it. They benefit mankind as a whole only if they inspire an army of relatively prosaic but professionally competent professionals to succeed them.

Making the teaching of disadvantaged children in disadvantaged schools attractive to competent personnel is not essentially a different task from making other socially valuable but ordinary unpleasant tasks vocationally acceptable. Undertaking, cleaning of sewers, garbage removal, and taking care of the sick and the aged belong in this category. Policemen, firemen, clergymen, doctors, and lawyers from time to time have to deal with aspects of life that are ugly and revolting.

How are such callings and tasks made tolerable and even honorable? First by routinization, *i.e.*, knowing how to deal with them step by step with predetermined procedures. An imperfect routine is better than no routine. At a time when educators turn their noses up at anything that is not creative, routine is not exciting; but for that very reason children and teachers may value the security routine affords, especially if we are to believe that these children often regard the schoolroom as a real or symbolic threat. Anyone who has seen a nurse clean up a sick patient two or three times within an hour realizes that it is routine procedure—one step following another according to a fixed rule—and skill that carries her through what would drive most of us screaming out of the room. One can be sure that the nurse brings in the pretty flowers and puts them into a vase with more pleasure than she cleans up a retching patient; but she routinizes both, just as she routinizes the taking of temperatures and joshing with elderly gentlemen.

However, routinization by itself is not enough to make an unpleasant task attractive to an intelligent worker. Dependable routines may make practical nursing tolerable but not the practice of medicine. Examining feces under a microscope and emptying bedpans differ primarily in the intellectual quality of the tasks being performed. A surgeon and a butcher both cut and manipulate blood and tissue, but the vocational difference is enormous. Intellectualization is a great transformer of occupational valence. It is not so much the intrinsic unpleasantness of a calling that repels intelligent prospective practitioners as its lack of intellectual quality, its low demand on the person's cognitive powers. This is especially important if the persons we hope to attract to teaching the disadvantaged classroom are to have good brains as well as a strong sense of social service.

Routine and intellectualization provide the depersonalization that makes it possible for us to deal with emotionally charged situations efficiently. If we feel the pain of the patient, the misery of the pupil or the world too keenly, we cannot do our best in relieving these evils. Some situations are so painful to those personally involved in them that society has developed classes of people who do what must be done without personal involvement. Teaching the difficult pupil in a difficult environment is one such situation. How to maintain concern for the child without becoming a parental or sibling substitute is an especially

---

[6]H. Knobloch and B. Pascamanick, "Environmental Factors Affecting Human Development Before and After Birth," *Pediatrics* (August, 1960), also H. Knobloch and B. Pascamanick, "The Relationship of Race and Sociometric Status to the Development of Motor Behavior Patterns in Infancy," *Social Aspects of Psychiatry*, American Psychiatric Association, Psychiatric Research Reports No. 10 (December, 1958).

ticklish problem for the teacher. If teachers are to love pupils, it cannot be in the ordinary meaning of love.

Teaching the culturally deprived child, especially when it is a child from a poor slum environment, can be unpleasant; but I dare say that the unpleasantness of dirty appearance and other stigmata of poverty are not the most important repellents to the prospective teacher. More important are the frustrations that go with inadequate motivation, inadequate time, inadequate materials, and the amount of time that has to be spent on non-instructional activity. As a colleague of mine has said: It is the beating of one's head against a stone wall that frightens the teacher away from the disadvantaged school.

Accordingly, over and above all that training institutions can possibly hope to do by way of routinization and intellectualization, there remains the task for the community and the school administrator to provide the conditions under which the trained teacher can function profitably, both psychologically and educationally.

My second set of remarks have to do with the superficial plausibility of rushing into a literacy repair job-preparation type of schooling to rescue the culturally deprived child. At a time when even well-trained craftsmen are in danger of becoming displaced by automation or the obsolescence of their job skills, does it make sense to mount a massive educational effort that will place a whole generation of culturally deprived people into the lowest level of jobs? It is better, to be sure, than remaining on the relief rolls; but is it equality of educational opportunity? Is it an adequate training for the retraining that is anticipated for so many workers?

What is there to assure us that rescuing a generation from the relief rolls will automatically make them into the kind of self-respecting, cognitively sophisticated, skillful people who will rear children whom the state will not have to rescue by another crash program? Only if the children we rescue master a basic program of general education in the sciences and the humanities is there any hope of getting all segments of our society operating under their own power.

The demands of vocation, citizenship, and personal adequacy in the new society will call for 12 years of common general studies as a minimum for every citizen, including the culturally deprived. In the next few decades anyone with less than this will be culturally deprived indeed.

I agree with those who hold that the most mortal insult one can proffer a human being is to demand less from him than from his fellows. The Negro and other victims of cultural deprivation should not be tempted to settle for a second-rate set of expectations from themselves. Indeed there is evidence to the effect that their aspirations are high. Whether they can live up to these expectations cannot be known until we make good the deficiencies that prevent their true potentialities from being manifested. Differences in talent and energy will and should out, but these are not differences in the essential needs of humanity: the desire for self-determination, self-realization, and some sort of self-integration. And it is to these generic human needs that general education is directed.

So in devising the approach to the education of the culturally deprived child, let us keep the ultimate sights as high as for the rest of the population. Remedial, compensatory measures should be regarded as temporary; and we should be wary lest all the promised funds be drained off in these temporary measures. The national delusion that our way of life, our values, and aspirations are all determined by our bank account makes it all too plausible to believe that merely getting people off the relief rolls will change their modes of life, whereas it may merely enable them to finance an old mode of life from another source. Economical repleteness and cultural repleteness are not synonymous.

There is some reason to believe, on the basis of some recent studies on the motivation of lower-class adolescents, that they are not so hostile to all the values of middle-class achievements as is sometimes alleged. They do want the things the affluent society can give them; and given a reasonable skill in achieving them, there is little doubt that they can achieve them. The justification of affluence is that it makes the peculiarly human qualities of life—the intellectual, moral, aesthetic, and religious qualities—more easily realized and more widely dispersed. The job does not produce these qualities; it merely relieves the economic pressures that militate against them.

This brings me to the last observation. It is that we ought not to take for granted that the culturally deprived children may not have something that ought to be preserved as we clean them up, fatten them up, and get them jobs. It has been often noted that the upper-upper classes and the lower-lower ones have in common an indifference to what the middle classes cherish. To be sure they despise the middlers in different ways; but each enjoys a freedom from middle-class con-

ventions and morality, one because it can afford to defy them, and the other because it has nothing to lose by defying them. In matters of sex, aggression, living for the day, scorn of thrift, disdain for steady employment, love of sensual enjoyment, a desire for moving about, the very loftly and the very low resemble each other more than they do the middle class.

Now while the middle class is still the backbone of the nation, it is also the stuffed shirt of the nation. The mediocrity, the crass materialism, the status hunger, the fear of originality—all of these less admirable traits of the middle class—one should foist upon the culturally deprived with great hesitation. There is a real question here as to who is deprived and of what?

The slum child, it has been shown repeatedly, may be sophisticated within his own *milieu;* he manages shrewdly and well in a hard situation; he is tough and resourceful. It would be a shame to strip him of these admirable qualities in favor of a merely softer and more prolonged infancy. Perhaps our schools can learn from the culturally deprived how to toughen up our culturally replete youngsters and make them more self-reliant, less prone to run to their parents for the latest toy, the latest clothes, the fanciest entertainment, help in their homework, and intercession with the school authorities and even the police.

What I am saying so awkwardly is that our determination to do what we ought to have done long ago for the culturally deprived—or more precisely, what we should have done for ourselves—is a chance to look at ourselves and ask whether we of the middle classes are the true mold by which the unfortunate are to be made fortunate. Is there not a better model? There is, and it is a classless model. That model is a combination of traits hammered out by the wisdom of the ages from the great insights of the Greeks and Jews and the Christians, the science and the literature of the West, not to speak of the wisdom of the East. In this model, I dare say, the solid virtues of thrift, cleanliness, honesty, industry, and dependability will be written large; but I am equally sure that the quickness of mind and hand, the independent spirit of the gamin, the willingness to take life in its immediacy with all of its fresh flavor, the readiness to laugh, to love, and to enjoy the vividness of experience will not be missing. In equalizing educational opportunity, let it be opportunity for the best.

The Disadvantaged Child: Primary Group Training for Secondary Group Life

Continued from page 5

styles differ in significant ways from those of the middle class patterns, (2) compared to middle class performances, lower class socialization is less adequate, (3) the lower class system of interactions and relationships is characterized by what is here termed "primary group relatedness" while the dominant middle class system is one of secondary *as well as* primary interactions and relationships.

Considering first the inappropriate value-orientations and life styles, and following the practice of outlining and citing more detailed references, studies indicate lower class groups differ from middle class in several critical areas. *First,* the lower class child lives in a world where social problems appear with greater frequency than they do in the world of the middle class child (16,23). He is more likely to have viewed and/or experienced familial discord, physical violence, drug addiction, drunkenness, mental illness, crime, and delinquency. In this sense, and probably only in this sense, he comes to the school with a broader range of experiences than does the middle class child. *Secondly,* he lacks the conventional manners and courtesies of the middle class child, especially with respect to the more formalized patterns and the symbolic substitues for physical action (2). *Thirdly,* the occupational value-orientations of the adults differ in ways that devalue occupations and work. Where the middle class father tends to view work as important in itself, and to merge his personality in the occupational role, the lower class father views work as a means to other goals, seldom as an end in itself. Where the middle class father thinks in terms of occupational advancement and success, the lower class father tends to think in terms of security, activity, and the immediate gratification of consumer desires (8, 21). Closely related to the occupational value-orientations are the fourth set of distinguishing factors, the cluster of characteristics described as the achievement syndrome and delayed gratification pattern. Compared to the middle class the lower class is less achievement oriented, less concerned with individual success or with the attainment of high status or of upward mobility as a success goal (9, 14, 17, 25).